

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**AND**

**BROOKHAVEN SCIENCE ASSOCIATES, LLC**

**ATTACHMENT J.2**

**APPENDIX B**

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND  
MEASUREMENT PLAN**

**FISCAL YEAR 2009**

**BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Introduction	1
I	Determining The Contractor's Performance Rating, And Performance-Based Fee	2
II	Performance Goals, Objectives & Performance Measures	8
III	Schedule	9
 Goals, Objectives, Measures and Targets		
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1	Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field	12
1.2	Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology	12
1.3	Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives & Goals	13
1.4	Provide for Effective Delivery of Products	14
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1	Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)	19
2.2	Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	21
2.3	Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities	22
2.4	Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community	23
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision	27
3.2	Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management	28
3.3	Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs	28
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans	35
4.2	Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	36
4.3	Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate	37

<b>5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</b>	39
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment	39
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management	40
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention	42
<b>6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)</b>	44
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	44
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System	45
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System	46
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program	46
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate	48
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	49
<b>7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs</b>	51
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs	51
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs	52
<b>8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems</b>	54
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	54
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	54
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property	56
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information	57

## INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Brookhaven Science Associates (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Brookhaven National Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Determining Total Available Performance Fee and Fee Earned," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, or Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures and Targets (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures/Targets) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Site Office. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the performance-based incentives fee earned (if any) will be determined. As applicable, Section I also provides information on the award term eligibility requirements.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

**I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, AND  
PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE**

The available fee for FY 2009 is \$7,400,000. The FY 2009 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2009. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

**Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions**

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. For the purpose of determining the final Goal grade, the raw numerical score for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point utilizing the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Table B. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing the raw numerical score for each Goal within Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall raw score for each.

As stated above, the raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight <sup>1</sup>	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			39%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			36%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			25%		
<b>Total Score</b>					
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			25%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			20%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			15%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			20%		
<b>Total Score</b>					

**Table A. FY 2009 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation**

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0

**Table B. FY 2008 Contractor Letter Grade Scale**

**Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:**

The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C, below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2009 as calculated within Table D.

<sup>1</sup> Any weightings provided for each S&T Goal listed within Table A are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are shown for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining the overall S&T score will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.



Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

<b>Overall Fee Determination</b>	
<b>Percent S&amp;T Fee Earned from Table C.</b>	
<b>M&amp;O Fee Multiplier from Table C.</b>	X
<b>Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee</b>	

**Table D. – Final Percentage of Performance-Based Fee Earned Determination**

<b>Earned Fee Calculation</b>	
<b>Available Fee</b>	
<b>Overall Earned Performance -Base Fee (Table D)</b>	X
<b>Earned Fee</b>	

**Table E. – Earned Fee Calculation**

**Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination:**

The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor performance-based grades for each Goal and fee earned determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Performance Goal achievements.

## **II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

### **Background**

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

## Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections 1.0 through 8.0 describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated Performance Measures for FY 2009

### III. Schedule

In order to clearly define the path forward, the following generic schedule is presented as a guide. The Contractor and Brookhaven Site Office (BHSO) acknowledge that the nature of the processes involved demands flexibility in the schedules.

#### FY 2009 Performance Evaluation Schedule

##### October:

- October 1 - Site Office incorporates PEMP into the prime contract for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- October 1 - The Contractor initiates the Self-Evaluation process for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week – The Contractor sends the Site Office its performance evaluation of the PEMP for the Third Period. Site Office conducts the Third Period performance status review for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.

##### November:

- November 15 - The Contractor submits its Annual Self-Evaluation Report to BHSO for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- November 15 – SC HQ, AD and other customer input due to BHSO Manager for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.

##### December:

- BHSO sends draft Performance Appraisal Report to the Contractor for review.

##### January:

- First Week - Site Office Performance Evaluation Presentation for SC-1 due to SC Office of Laboratory Policy for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week - Annual SC Laboratory Appraisal Meetings and Presentations to SC-1 for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Last Week - Site Office adjustments to evaluations finalized as necessary based on results of SC-1 presentation and SC-1 approvals issued for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.

##### February:

- BHSO transmits the final BHSO Annual Performance Appraisal Report for the **Completed Fiscal Year** to the Contractor.

- Third Week – The Contractor sends the Site Office its performance evaluation of the PEMP for the First Period. Site Office conducts the First Period performance status review for the **Current Fiscal Year**.

**May:**

- BHSO and The Contractor begin drafting the Measures and Targets for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- May 1 - SC Laboratory Performance Assessment Process - Fiscal Year Supplemental Guidance issued to Site Offices for the **Next Fiscal Year**.

**June:**

- Third Week – The Contractor sends the Site Office its performance evaluation of the PEMP for the Second Period. Site Office conducts mid-year performance status review with input from HQ Program Offices for the **Current Fiscal Year**.
- BHSO and the Contractor work on measures and targets, then compile the draft PEMP for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- June 30 - The Contractor submits draft PEMP (Goals 4 to 8) to BHSO.

**July:**

- Second Week – Site Office and the Contractor senior management meet on the PEMP's final draft for the **Next Fiscal Year**.

**August:**

- August 1 - BHSO sends its final draft to DOE/SC Office of Laboratory Policy.
- SC Program ADs and Site Office Managers meet to review PEMP for **Next Fiscal Year**.

**September:**

- Second Week – SC PEMP Review Board comments issued to the Site Office as needed & Site Office incorporates/disposes comments for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week – SC PEMP Review Board Meeting to discuss final PEMP approval recommendations to SC-1 for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week - Site Office issues a call for SC year-end evaluation input (due to Site Office by November 15) for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Last Week - SC PEMP Review Board presents recommendations to SC-1 and receives SC-1 approval for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- Last Week - SC-1 approval memo issued to the Site Offices for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- September 30 - The Goals, Objectives, Measures and Targets for the **Next Fiscal Year** will be ready to be incorporated into DOE's Prime Contract with the Contractor.

## 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

**The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.**

The weight of this Goal is 39%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) .2%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 28.4%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 5.4%
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) 10.4%
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) 41.6%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) .2%
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) 12.5%
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) .4%
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) .9%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal

and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices..

### 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

<b>A</b>	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
<b>A+</b>	
<b>B+</b>	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
<b>B</b>	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
<b>C</b>	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
<b>D</b>	Failure of multiple program elements.
<b>F</b>	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

### 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor "guessed right" in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;

- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;
- Staff members visible in leadership position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

<b>A to A+</b>	Laboratory staff lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
<b>B</b>	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
<b>C</b>	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
<b>D</b>	Failure of multiple program elements.
<b>F</b>	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

### 1.3 Provide and Sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives & Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measures through defined project products, progress reports, statements of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quantity and quality of program/project (e.g., technical reports, policy papers, prototype demonstrations, tasks, etc.) output(s) be it policy, R&D, or implementation programs;
- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer-reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

<b>A to A+</b>	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of work.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are universally positive; output(s) meet the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; work demonstrates progress against review



	recommendations and/or headquarters guidance.
<b>B</b>	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are largely positive, with only a few minor deficiencies and/or slightly negative responses noted; minor deficiencies and/or negative responses have little to no potential to adversely impact the overall program/project.
<b>C</b>	A number of outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify a number of deficiencies and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
<b>D</b>	Most outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
<b>F</b>	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

#### 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measures through progress reports, peer-reviews; Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals/milestones documented within FWPs and/or other such documents;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises and/or getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and/or responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

<b>A to A+</b>	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and results anticipate HQ guidance.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
<b>B</b>	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are meet; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact the overall program/project.

<b>C</b>	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g less than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project is not corrected.
<b>D</b>	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
<b>F</b>	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

Science Program Office <sup>2</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall BES Total					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
Overall HEP Total					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall NP Total					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall WDTS Total					

**Table 1.1 – 1.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development**

<sup>2</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			.2%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			32.9%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			6.3%		
Office of High Energy Physics			12.1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			48.2%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			.2%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

**Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>3</sup>**

HQ Program Office <sup>4</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation					
1.1 Impact			15%		
1.2 Leadership			15%		
1.3 Output			35%		
1.4 Delivery			35%		
Overall DNN Total					
Department of Homeland Security					
1.1 Impact			55%		
1.2 Leadership			15%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall DHS Total					
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall EERE Total					

**Table 1.3 – 1.0 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development**

<sup>3</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

<sup>4</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			86.2%		
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			12.5%		
Department of Homeland Security			.4%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			.9%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

**Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>5</sup>**

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Table 1.5 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

<sup>5</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

## **2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities**

**The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory research facilities; and are responsive to the user community.**

The weight of this Goal is 36%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 2.1, & 2.2). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) .2%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 32.9%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 6.3%
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) 12.1%
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) 48.2%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) .2%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by SC.

### Objectives:

## **2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information needed to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process.; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

<b>A to A+</b>	In addition to meeting all measures under B <sup>+</sup> , the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
<b>B+</b>	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE apprised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
<b>B</b>	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
<b>D</b>	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
<b>F</b>	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

## 2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

<b>A to A+</b>	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; Reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
<b>B+</b>	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
<b>B</b>	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; Reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
<b>D</b>	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
<b>F</b>	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.



## 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and
- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

<b>A to A+</b>	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned; Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
<b>B</b>	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low, beam delivery, or luminosity is well below expectations. Facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, <b>or</b> acquisition operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
<b>D</b>	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. Acquisition operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, <b>or</b> acquisition operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
<b>F</b>	The facility fails to operate; acquisition operates well below steady state <b>and/or</b> the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

## 2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor's efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory's research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;
- Contractor's ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and
- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

<b>A to A+</b>	Reviews document that multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways, that the facility is being used to pursue influential science, that full advantage has been taken of the facility to enhance external user access, and strengthen the laboratory's research base. A healthy outreach program is in place.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Reviews state strong and effective approach exists toward establishing a large external and internal user community; that the facility is being used for influential science; the laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal scientific capabilities. A healthy outreach program is in place.
<b>B</b>	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of the facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
<b>C</b>	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
<b>D</b>	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
<b>F</b>	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office <sup>6</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			0%		
Overall ASCR Total					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			20%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			30%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			40%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			10%		
Overall BES Total					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			90%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			10%		
Overall BER Total					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			40%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			60%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			0%		
Overall HEP Total					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			85%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			15%		
Overall NP Total					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			0%		

<sup>6</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

2.4 Utilization of Facility			0%		
Overall WDTs Total					

**Table 2.1 – 2.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development**

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			.2%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			32.9%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			6.3%		
Office of High Energy Physics			12.1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			48.2%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			.2%		
Performance Goal 2.0 Total					

**Table 2.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>7</sup>**

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Goal Final Letter Grade**

**Table 2.3 – 2.0**

<sup>7</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

### 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

**The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.**

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) .2%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 28.4%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 5.4%
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) 10.4%
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) 41.6%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) .2%
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) 12.5%
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) .4%
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) .9%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal

and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

**3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

<b>A to A+</b>	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
<b>B+</b>	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
<b>B</b>	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who talented in most programs.
<b>C</b>	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
<b>D</b>	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even

	reasonably talented scientists.
<b>F</b>	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented scientists.

### 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and/or user facility strategic plans
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.).

<b>A to A+</b>	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
<b>B</b>	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
<b>C</b>	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
<b>D</b>	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
<b>F</b>	No planning is done.

### 3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;

- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

<b>A to A+</b>	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives <i>always</i> initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt
<b>B</b>	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
<b>C</b>	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
<b>D</b>	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
<b>F</b>	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.



<b>Science Program Office<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>Overall ASCR Total</b>					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>Overall BES Total</b>					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
<b>Overall BER Total</b>					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>Overall HEP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>Overall NP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
<b>Overall WDTS Total</b>					

**Table 3.1 – 3.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development**

<sup>8</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			.2%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			32.9%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			6.3%		
Office of High Energy Physics			12.1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			48.2%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			.2%		
Performance Goal 3.0 Total					

**Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>9</sup>**

HQ Program Office <sup>10</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall DNN Total					
Department of Homeland Security					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			20%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall DHS Total					
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
Overall EERE Total					

**Table 3.3 – 3.0 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development**

<sup>9</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

<sup>10</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			86.2%		
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			12.5%		
Department of Homeland Security			.4%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			.9%		
Performance Goal 3.0 Total					

**Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>11</sup>**

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Goal Final Letter Grade**

**Table 3.5 – 3.0**

<sup>11</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

**Attachment I**

**Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings**

**Office of Science**

		<b>ASCR</b>	<b>BES</b>	<b>BER</b>	<b>HEP</b>	<b>NP</b>	<b>WDTS</b>
		<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>
<b>Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment</b>							
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>65%</b>
1.1 Impact (significance)		40%	50%	30%	30%	35%	25%
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30%	20%	20%	30%	25%	30%
1.3 Output (productivity)		15%	15%	20%	20%	25%	30%
1.4 Delivery		15%	15%	30%	20%	15%	15%
<b>Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>							
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0%</b>
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		0%	20%	0%	40%	0%	0%
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		0%	30%	0%	60%	0%	0%
2.3 Operation of Facility		0%	40%	90%	0%	85%	0%
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community		0%	10%	10%	0%	15%	0%
<b>Goal #3 Program Management</b>							
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>35%</b>
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30%	40%	20%	40%	40%	20%
3.2 Program Planning and Management		40%	30%	30%	40%	40%	40%
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30%	30%	50%	20%	20%	40%

## Attachment I

### Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

#### All Other Customers

	DNN	DHS	EERE
	Weight	Weight	Weight
<b>Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment<sup>12</sup></b>			
<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>50%</b>
1.1 Impact (significance)	15%	55%	25%
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	15%	15%	25%
1.3 Output (productivity)	35%	15%	25%
1.4 Delivery	35%	15%	25%
<b>Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>			
<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)	0%	0%	0%
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	0%	0%	0%
2.3 Operation of Facility	0%	0%	0%
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community	0%	0%	0%
<b>Goal 3.0 Program Management</b>			
<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>50%</b>
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	20%	30%	34%
3.2 Program Planning and Management	40%	20%	33%
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	40%	50%	33%

<sup>12</sup> The Goal and Objective weights are based on previous discussions with the Other Customers.

**Goal 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory**

**The Contractor's leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the laboratory.**

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

**Objective 4.1 - Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans.**

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

**Measure 4.1.1**

The Contractor will deliver and implement an effective integrated strategy to sustain the viability of the Laboratory as a leading scientific institution into the foreseeable future.

**Target 4.1.1.1**

The Laboratory Plan (or Strategic Plan) supports the mission of the DOE and the DOE Office of Science, is updated annually and establishes a compelling agenda for the future of the laboratory.

**Target 4.1.1.2**

The Laboratory's strategic agenda is implemented through the alignment of work and resources by setting annual institutional performance expectations as documented in the Annual Laboratory Plan, Organizational Business Plans, and Individual Performance Plans.

**Target 4.1.1.3**

The Contractor's Laboratory management team monitors progress and reports performance against the institutional performance expectations described in Target 4.1.1.2. Reporting is made to relevant stakeholders, including BHSO. BHSO will evaluate the effectiveness of the Contractor's performance monitoring.

**Target 4.1.1.4**

The Contractor effectively adjusts the Annual Laboratory Plan to reflect changes in institutional priorities. The Contractor will document changes to the Annual Laboratory Plan and formally submit those changes to BHSO. BHSO will evaluate these with input from the Program Offices or other external reviewers.

## **Objective 4.2 – Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization.**

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

### **Measure 4.2.1**

The Contractor's Laboratory management team is responsible and accountable for Laboratory performance and the effective management of operational issues.

#### **Target 4.2.1.1**

The Contractor's Laboratory management team demonstrates effective leadership and accountability across the Laboratory through:

- Effective stewardship of DOE assets
- Disseminating and monitoring performance expectations throughout the Laboratory
- Holding managers accountable
- Effectively providing for the development and promotion of future managers through an effective mentoring, training and recruitment program.

#### **Target 4.2.1.2**

The Contractor's Laboratory management team will engage constructively with the Contractor's Corporate Office to ensure they fully understand and, where necessary, assist in resolution of Laboratory issues including those related to environmental cleanup.

### **Measure 4.2.2**

The Contractor will ensure strategic internal and external communication that raises stakeholder awareness of and appreciation for the importance of long-term basic research; the DOE/the Laboratory facilities where this research is done; and, the managerial and operational work that enables it.

#### **Target 4.2.2.1**

The Contractor will deliver communications and public outreach that raise public awareness of, and appreciation for, the Laboratory's research programs and projects and DOE and the Laboratory's key research facilities. The Contractor will also align communications with the Department/SC policies, messages and themes and coordinate with the Department, SC and BHSO. The Fiscal Year 2009 Community, Education, Government and Public Affairs Business Plan will outline the communications and public outreach initiatives that will be implemented to meet this measure.

### **Measure 4.2.3**

The Contractor demonstrates the implementation of effective and sustainable institutional-level self-assessment, corrective action management, and feedback and improvement processes.

**Target 4.2.3.1**

Performance objectives and expectations for the conduct and quality of self-assessment are communicated at all levels of the organization as an integral part of the business planning process. Self assessments will take into account results from external and internal assessments.

**Target 4.2.3.2**

The Contractor will review Business plans for the effective utilization of the results of self-assessments to drive organizational performance improvements and effective management of corrective actions.

**Target 4.2.3.3**

The Contractor collects and analyzes the results of institutional and line assessments and monitors progress on corrective action management. The Contractor's Laboratory Management Team uses the results to provide feedback into institutional decision-making and assurance processes. Results are reported to BHSO through Contractor Assurance System and Performance Management reporting mechanisms.

**Measure 4.2.4**

The Contractor will pursue opportunities to reduce the cost of doing business in areas such as operational efficiency, program execution, business strategies, and labor and benefits through the development of a Cost Savings Plan.

**Target 4.2.4.1**

The Contractor will develop a Cost Savings plan, agreed to by BHSO, that identifies the major cost categories, cost drivers, and cost elements (fixed and variable) and potential cost savings within each category. The Plan should consider current and future expenses and funding. A draft Cost Savings Plan to meet these expectations will be delivered to BHSO by June 30, 2009. The Cost Savings Plan will include cost savings implementation milestones.

**Objective 4.3 - Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate.**

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

**Measure 4.3.1**

The Contractor's Corporate Office will provide resources to demonstrate its commitment to the success of the Laboratory. Consideration will be given to the strategic impact and the magnitude of corporate support.

**Target 4.3.1.1**

Tangible resources will be provided by the Contractor's Corporate Office to facilitate Laboratory objectives. The resources may be in various forms, such as:



- Enhancing relationships with state and local entities.
- Assuring leadership positions are filled in a timely manner.
- Leveraging agreements with external partners.
- Assisting with infrastructure improvement opportunities.
- Increasing operating efficiency.
- Supporting effort to increase efficiency of business and effectively manage indirect expenses.
- Establishing joint appointments that are aligned with the strategic objectives of the Lab.
- Providing staff, expert advice, management systems, or similar assistance to achieve the Laboratory objectives.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory</b>					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			30%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			40%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate			30%		
Goal 4.0 Total					

**Goal 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection**

**The Contractor protects the safety and health of the DOE contractor workforce, subcontractors, the community, and the environment in all DOE-sponsored work at the site, and sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well-deployed system.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

**Objective 5.1 - Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment**

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

**Measure 5.1.1**

The Contractor will demonstrate progress in achieving and maintaining “best in class” safety and health performance through meeting Office of Science injury rate goals.

**Target 5.1.1.1**

The Contractor will meet the Office of Science goal of 0.25 DART cases per 200,000 hours worked.

**Target 5.1.1.2**

The Contractor will meet the Office of Science goal of 0.65 TRC cases per 200,000 hours worked.

**Measure 5.1.2**

Within the framework of its Integrated Safety Management System, the Contractor will focus on reducing worker injuries through effective feedback and improvement mechanisms that include a healthy reporting culture, event tracking and trending, effective causal analysis, and lessons learned communications.

**Target 5.1.2.1**

To demonstrate effective implementation of feedback and improvement processes for ES&H performance the Contractor and BHSO will mutually develop an assessment checklist by November 2008. Using the checklist, BHSO will evaluate a representative sample of issues/events for appropriate categorization and effective causal analysis.

**Measure 5.1.3**

The Contractor will demonstrate exemplary safety performance on Environmental Management projects.

**Target 5.1.3.1**

BSA will achieve a “Green” safety performance as reported in the Environmental Management (EM) Quarterly Performance Review throughout the Fiscal Year.

## **Objective 5.2 - Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management**

The weight of this Objective is 60%.

### **Measure 5.2.1**

The Contractor will implement, maintain, and continually improve the Work Planning and Control Process.

#### **Target 5.2.1.1**

The Contractor will demonstrate effective implementation of the three tiered Work Planning & Control Process based on BHSO evaluation of a representative sample of work permits, Experimental Safety Reviews (ESRs) and Worker Planned Work that identify ES&H risks and clearly state environmental and occupational health and safety (ESH) policies, programs and objectives appropriate for the Laboratory operations.

A mutually developed assessment checklist will be used to assess the effectiveness of the implementation. The checklist will be completed by January 31, 2009.

### **Measure 5.2.2**

The Contractor will develop and implement improvements in the management of fire and chemical hazards in BNL facilities.

#### **Target 5.2.2.1**

The Contractor will complete agreed upon elements from the FY08 Fire Safety Strategic Plan workshop. The elements will be agreed to by November 2008.

#### **Target 5.2.2.2**

The Contractor will develop an appropriate risk-based project plan to address chemical management (procurement, inventory tracking, handling, storage, fire loading, and emergency management notification of changes) across the institution.

### **Measure 5.2.3**

The Contractor will demonstrate effective implementation of their safety observation process for Level 1, 2, and 3 Managers.

#### **Target 5.2.3.1**

- Level 1, 2, 3 Managers will conduct three safety observations per quarter (90% of Level 1, 2, and 3 Managers meeting goal).
- At mid-year, the Contractor will conduct a self-assessment of the effectiveness of the safety observations by surveying the managers involved.

The results will be shared and opportunities for improvements will be implemented if feasible.

#### **Measure 5.2.4**

Ensure corrective action effectiveness stemming from the 10CFR851 Gap Analysis Corrective Action Plan.

##### **Target 5.2.4.1**

Functional areas that have been closed in the 10 CFR 851 Gap Analysis Corrective Action Plan will be evaluated for effective implementation by BHSO. An effectiveness review conducted during the third performance review period will be the method of this evaluation. Scope, criteria, and format of the review will be mutually agreed upon by BHSO and the Contractor.

#### **Measure 5.2.5**

ISO 14001 EMS and OHSAS 18001 Certification - The Contractor has acquired and maintained third-party certifications for the Environmental Management System (ISO 14001:2004) and the Occupational Safety and Health Management System (OHSAS 18001). These external certifications provide credibility and rigor to the implementation of the systems.

##### **Target 5.2.5.1**

Maintain certification of the Environmental Management System to the ISO 14001:2004 standard as determined by the third party audit.

##### **Target 5.2.5.2**

Maintain certification of the Occupational Safety & Health Management System to the OHSAS 18001 standard as determined by the third party audit.

#### **Measure 5.2.6**

The Contractor will demonstrate continuous improvement of the Laboratory Radiological Control program.

##### **Target 5.2.6.1**

The Contractor ALARA goal for FY 2009 will be based upon expected Laboratory operations. The goal shall consist of individual Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) radiological exposure estimates for each Directorate or organization that is required by the ALARA Program procedure (HP-SOP-020) to participate in the Laboratory ALARA Program (i.e., each Directorate or organization whose radiological operations resulted in an FY 2008 TEDE collective exposure to staff and matrixed support personnel greater than 100 person-mrem). The initial FY 2009 goal will be established and agreed upon by October 6, 2008.

*[Change control: The Contractor shall submit an ALARA adjustment request, if actual departmental exposures are not within +/- 10% of expected goals for each Directorate/organization whose collective radiation exposure exceeds one (1)*

*person-rem. The adjustment request for all other Directorates/organizations would be +/- 20%. If an ALARA request is necessary, The Contractor shall submit their request within the appropriate reporting period. Individual exposure goal changes must include a detailed explanation for the adjustment].*

### **Objective 5.3 – Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention.**

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

#### **Measure 5.3.1**

The Contractor will improve the cost effectiveness of waste management.

##### **Target 5.3.1.1**

Evaluate waste management options for routine waste streams generated by Lab operations to ensure the most efficient, cost effective and compliant means are utilized. Specifically by the end of May 2009 WM will evaluate a minimum of three (3) major waste streams to determine if they are optimally managed in terms of cost (including facility space needed), compliance, and environmental benefit. By September 30, 2009, a plan will be prepared identifying those actions needed to optimize the management of these waste streams.

#### **Measure 5.3.2**

The Contractor will contribute to pollution prevention and waste minimization through Environmentally Preferable Purchasing.

##### **Target 5.3.2.1**

Continue efforts to improve the Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) program. Activities will include: finalization of purchasing procedures and contracts requiring the use of EPP products; evaluation of new bio-based products; improving tracking of computer acquisitions to ensure Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) products are being purchased.

#### **Measure 5.3.3**

The Contractor will continue progress with disposition of nuclear materials, legacy waste, excess materials and chemicals, and environmental projects.

##### **Target 5.3.3.1**

The Laboratory will characterize all legacy radioactive material in the Building 801 vaults and will dispose of those materials for which a clear path to disposal exists. Legacy fuel and bulk americium are among those items contained in the vault which have no defined path to disposal. Materials of this nature will be repackaged, if necessary, and returned to the vault for safe storage until a clear path for disposal is developed. A report describing the total inventory of materials and identifying any items which have no identified path to disposal, or

will require future FY funding, will be submitted to the BHSO no later than September 15, 2009.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</b>					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			20%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management			60%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			20%		
Goal 5.0 Total					

**Goal 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of Laboratory Missions**

**The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to laboratory programs and its missions.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

**Objective 6.1 - Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).**

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

**Measure 6.1.1**

Timely reporting of financial information to BHSO.

**Target 6.1.1.1**

The Contractor will submit to DOE by 12:00 noon local time on the first workday of each month the Integrated Contractor Summary of Collections and meet the reporting deadline 11 out of the 12 months with no submissions beyond the first workday of the month.

**Target 6.1.1.2**

The Contractor will submit to DOE by 12:00 noon local time on the second workday of each month the STARS data file and meet the reporting deadline 11 out of the 12 months with no submissions beyond the second workday of each month.

**Measure 6.1.2**

Budget formulation documents submitted are of high quality and in a timely manner.

**Target 6.1.2.1**

The Laboratory submits its FY 2010 budget in accordance with format, content, and schedule prescribed by BHSO. The BHSO annual budget validation reports no significant findings.

**Measure 6.1.3**

The effectiveness of the Financial Management System is validated by internal and external audits, assurances and reviews such as the Contractor's implementation of OMB Circular A-123, and Internal, DOE IG and GAO audits.

**Target 6.1.3.1**

The audit reports will disclose no material weaknesses.

**Measure 6.1.4**

The effectiveness of the budget and cost processes and systems is validated by no significant cost overruns or suspense items being reported in STARS.

**Target 6.1.4.1**

Costs do not exceed the amount of funding (obligations) provided in the contract. In addition, the Integrated Cost Overrun account is reviewed and managed such that this account is only used for undistributed overhead costs and is reduced to ZERO at year-end.

**Objective 6.2 - Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System.**

The weight of this Objective is 12.5%.

**Measure 6.2.1**

The Contractor Procurement Balanced Scorecard (BSC) will meet BHSO expectations.

**Target 6.2.1.1**

The Contractor must achieve 90% of the BSC Measures.

**Measure 6.2.2**

Demonstrate that adequate procurement staffing levels have been achieved and maintained to accomplish and sustain the goals and objectives of planned initiatives, strategic plans and corrective actions.

**Target 6.2.2.1**

The necessary level will be established jointly by the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year.

**Measure 6.2.3**

The continued certification of the procurement system

**Target 6.2.3.1**

The result of a successful PERT review or an assessment that has been verified and validated by BHSO. Success requires an "Adequate" or higher rating in each of the 10 PERT purchasing tenets.

**Measure 6.2.4**

PPM will submit documents requiring Site Office review and/or approval in a timely fashion and which are of a high quality with no critical issues: Examples include but are not limited to subcontract actions in excess of established thresholds and Procurement procedure updates.

**Target 6.2.4.1**



All subcontract actions requiring site office Contract Review Boards are planned for and documents are received in a timely fashion. All other actions meet the established timeframes required by the site office or have legitimate written rationale to explain delays.

**Target 6.2.4.2**

DOE Contract Review Board, Independent Review Boards and Business Clearance Reviews result in no critical comments/issues that would be considered a material weakness in the procurement package.

**Measure 6.2.5**

PPM demonstrates a commitment to process improvement in the Acquisition Management System.

**Target 6.2.5.1**

At the beginning of the first quarter, PPM will identify at least two procurement areas for process improvements and will secure BHSO concurrence by the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year. A report will be provided to the contracting officer, by the end of the fiscal year, with an implementation plan describing how and when the process improvements are to be implemented.

**Objective 6.3 - Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System.**

The weight of this Objective is 12.5%.

**Measure 6.3.1**

The Contractor Property Balanced Scorecard (BSC) will meet BHSO expectations.

**Target 6.3.1.1**

The Contractor must achieve 90% of the BSC Measures.

**Measure 6.3.2**

**The Property Walkthrough Program will meet BHSO expectations.**

**Target 6.3.2.1**

Ninety percent (90%) of the scheduled Walkthroughs will be completed, and all findings and observations will be addressed in 60 days.

**Objective 6.4 - Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program.**

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

**Measure 6.4.1**

BHSO will determine the effectiveness of the Contractors recruitment, retention, benefits and compensation programs.

**Target 6.4.1.1**

By the end of FY 2009, the Contractor will have filled 75% of the positions identified as strategic hires. The strategic hires list will be mutually agreed upon by BHSO and the Contractor in the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter.

**Target 6.4.1.2**

Percent of terminating employees with the two highest performance levels, Distinguished and Commendable Performance (DP & CP), will be 10% less the percentage of the Laboratory's overall population within those two performance levels.

**Target 6.4.1.3**

The Contractor will demonstrate proactive efforts in monitoring effectiveness of the Contractor's benefits program. The Contractor will generate a report at the end of the fiscal year that documents cost savings of \$100,000.

**Target 6.4.1.4**

CY 2009 salary plan for Scientific Staff is within 2% of its targeted market position.

**Measure 6.4.2**

The Contractor demonstrates successful Diversity Management practices that have a positive impact on workforce demographics and foster an inclusive work environment.

**Target 6.4.2.1**

The Contractor will demonstrate strong leadership in, and management of, people diversity through continued shifts in representation across management positions (AAP Job Groups 1A-1F). Where opportunities exist, create a more diverse workforce at the Laboratory by maintaining and/or increasing representation of women and historically underrepresented minorities by achieving a 2% shift in overall representation in management positions.

**Target 6.4.2.2**

Operations and Science departments will implement at least one diversity management component from their FY 2009 Business Plans over a multi-year period whereby 25% of the departments have implemented a diversity component in FY 2009 with the goal of increasing implementation by at least 10% in subsequent years.

**Objective 6.5 - Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate.**

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

**Measure 6.5.1**

Maintain quality management of the internal audit function through the adequacy of planning and execution of internal audits and timeliness of audit follow-up and resolution.

**Target 6.5.1.1**

Timely development and submission of FY 2010 Internal Audit Annual Plan that meets BHSO expectations.

**Target 6.5.1.2**

Internal Audit communicates regularly with the BHSO and OIG, and responds in a timely manner to ad hoc requests.

**Target 6.5.1.3**

Ensure continued independence of the Internal Audit function as documented in organizational self assessment.

**Target 6.5.1.4**

Eighty percent of the number of internal audits enumerated in the BHSO-approved FY 2009 Annual Plan will be completed.

**Target 6.5.1.5**

Internal Audit asserts that management's audit actions will be either (1) validated as closed or (2) rejected as not completed within the subsequent quarter from the date the Contractor deems the action complete.

**Measure 6.5.2**

The Contractor will demonstrate that it has effective information management processes in place for the business related administrative enterprise systems.

**Target 6.5.2.1**

The Contractor/ITD will demonstrate effective processes at the IT Service Desk through implementation of IT Service Management best practices such as ITIL and HDI Standards. ITD will perform a gap analysis with best practices, develop an improvement plan for FY 2009 and implement.

**Measure 6.5.3**

Legal Management – Deliver efficient, effective, and responsive legal services that enable the successful achievement of the Laboratory mission.

**Target 6.5.3.1**

Effective, efficient, and compliant use of the litigation management plan resulting in favorable and cost effective case resolution. This Target will be evaluated in a subjective manner, considering, for example:

- Number of noncompliances with the Contractor's BHSO-approved litigation management procedures.
- Number of cases resolved through settlement or ADR.
- Litigation avoidance measures or activities.
- Number and type of litigation cost control/reduction measures successfully implemented and/or taken.

**Target 6.5.3.2**

Pursuant to Laboratory policy and procedures, the Legal Office provides sound analysis and counsel on issues requiring legal attention. This Target will be evaluated in a subjective manner, considering, for example:

- Proactive and timeliness of identification by the Legal Office of legal issues for review.
- Timeliness of work product to client and BHSO.
- The results obtained by the work products.
- The level of satisfaction expressed by the Contractor management and staff, as determined through customer surveys, client group meetings, and/or other feedback.
- Level of interaction and cooperation with the BHSO counsel.

**Objective 6.6 - Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets.**

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

**Measure 6.6.1**

In accordance with its strategy and stewardship role, the Contractor will identify and protect intellectual assets and work to broaden the current portfolio.

**Target 6.6.1.1**

The Contractor will demonstrate proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology as measured by the timely reporting to DOE of new inventions, and timely filing of U.S. and, where appropriate, foreign patent applications to create intellectual property assets.

**Target 6.6.1.2**

The Contractor will take a proactive approach to marketing its technologies, and will be rated based on demonstration of its overall marketing effectiveness. Consideration will be given to such activities as maintaining current information on its Web pages, conducting presentations, issuing press releases and newsletters, and sending direct marketing packages.

### Measure 6.6.2

The Contractor will maintain, and seek to improve, effective and efficient processes for the Laboratory's WFO and CRADA programs to enable successful relationships with industry.

#### Target 6.6.2.1

The contractor will implement improvements to the WFO proposal and/or agreement process(es) that reduce processing times or that will lead to increases in efficiency to DOE's review and approval process.

#### Target 6.6.2.2

The contractor will implement improvements to the CRADA proposal and/or agreement process(es) that reduce processing times or that will lead to increases in efficiency to DOE's review and approval process.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			30%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System			12.5%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System			12.5%		
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, Responsive Human Resources Management System, and Diversity Program			20%		
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			15%		
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			10%		
Goal 6.0 Total					

**Goal 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs**

**The Contractor provides appropriate planning for laboratory facilities and infrastructure needs required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs, and manages DOE facilities and infrastructure in a cost effective manner that ensures their safe and reliable operation consistent with program missions needs and DOE stewardship requirements.**

The weight of this Goal is 15%.

**Objective 7.1 - Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs**

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

**Measure 7.1.1**

The Contractor will manage real property assets to meet program missions, maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution. The Mission Readiness approach will be used to develop the annual Office of Science Laboratory Plan by optimizing the allocation of infrastructure project funding through a risk-based evaluation and decision process (i.e. 3BPB and related budget processes).

**Target 7.1.1.1**

Complete an internal Mission Readiness assessment and identify capability gaps for incorporation into the Laboratory strategic and annual planning process. Support and implement an SC peer review process in FY 2009 and implement improvements for incorporation into the next annual process.

**Measure 7.1.2**

The Contractor will effectively plan, manage and control its Office of Environmental Management (EM) Projects throughout their life cycle.

**Target 7.1.2.1**

Annual Schedule Performance Index and Cost Performance Index will be maintained above 0.90.

**Measure 7.1.3**

The Contractor will implement an effective maintenance program and integrate the allocation of resources for maintenance (including deferred maintenance) with the Mission Readiness process through the Annual Laboratory Plan. Facilities and utility systems will be reliable and available to ensure that mission objectives can be accomplished.

**Target 7.1.3.1**

The Contractor will maintain reliable electrical and building infrastructure as measured by the existing infrastructure reliability index calculation. The infrastructure reliability index (RI) will be 0.9997 (or better) for FY 2009.

**Target 7.1.3.2**

The Contractor will implement the institutional commitments made in the annual Laboratory Plan in support of the Science Laboratories Infrastructure Modernization Initiative.

**Measure 7.1.4**

The Contractor's operations and facility management will demonstrate the application of proactive sustainable energy and environmental management practices. Implement the requirements and goals of the Department of Energy's Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative, and the Goals and Objectives contained in Executive Order 13423 (Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management) as described in the Site Executable Plan.

**Target 7.1.4.1**

Finalize the Executable Plan for the TEAM Initiative and implement the 2009 commitments in the plan.

**Target 7.1.4.2**

Demonstration of successful attainment of alternative fuel vehicles in the Laboratory's fleet as measured by the percentage (>85%) of alternative fuel vehicles purchased compared to the overall number of vehicles purchased (alternative fuel and non-alternative fuel).

**Objective 7.2 - Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs.**

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

**Measure 7.2.1**

The Contractor will effectively plan and manage the acquisition of utilities including load forecasting, utilities options studies, and negotiating long term utilities contract terms for recommendation to BHSO.

**Target 7.2.1.1**

The Contractor will facilitate the award of the electric power contract with a term that exceeds three years by the end of FY 2009.

**Measure 7.2.2**

The Contractor will successfully plan, implement, budget and obtain support for infrastructure projects to meet the needs of the Laboratory's Strategic Plan including the coordination of the site, facility, and utility needs of large programmatic projects to ensure the project-Lab infrastructure interface is well-managed.

**Target 7.2.2.1**

The Contractor will manage the approved Institutional General Plant Project (IGPP) program to meet the \$6.8M target identified in the Office of Science Annual Laboratory Plan dated 4/28/08.

**Target 7.2.2.2**

The Contractor will manage the approved line item projects to meet all identified milestones.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs</b>					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs			50%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs			50%		
Goal 7.0 Total					



**Goal 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems**

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system. Commensurate, to the greatest degree possible, with an "open campus" philosophy, protect laboratory facilities, personnel, and classified and sensitive information from harm by implementing effective safeguards, security, and emergency management programs.

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

**Objective 8.1 - Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System.**

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

**Measure 8.1.1**

The Contractor will implement and maintain an Emergency Management program in a state of readiness. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

**Target 8.1.1.1**

The completion of agreed upon compliance actions associated with the Emergency Management Improvement Project in FY 2009.

**Target 8.1.1.2**

Operational Emergencies are identified and reported, and impacts mitigated in a timely manner.

**Target 8.1.1.3**

Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate that emergency management systems are effective.

**Target 8.1.1.4**

Develop and demonstrate a formal, efficient and effective Training Program, which includes a formal program document and ERO position documentation, in accordance with the Emergency Plan.

**Target 8.1.1.5**

Develop and demonstrate a formal, efficient and effective Drill and Exercise Program, which includes a formal program document and formal compliant Drill and Exercise schedule, in accordance with the Emergency Plan.

**Objective 8.2 - Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security.**

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

**Measure 8.2.1**

The Contractor will implement the requirements of the Office of Science Program Cyber Security Plan (PCSP) and maintain a current Authority to Operate (ATO);

**Target 8.2.1.1**

The results of Cyber-Security program evaluations will be generally satisfactory, with only minor areas for improvement noted, demonstrating the Contractor's commitment to comply with DOE requirements.

**Measure 8.2.2**

The Contractor will assess and continuously improve the cyber-security system. They will protect the confidentiality, integrity and availability of Laboratory information and information systems while minimizing the impact to the open, collaborative, scientific environment.

**Target 8.2.2.1**

Plans of Action & Milestones (POA&M) will be completed on schedule, demonstrating the Contractor's commitment to continually improve Cyber-Security and address any shortcoming in implementing DOE requirements.

**Target 8.2.2.2**

Regular communication with all stakeholders – DOE, employees, guests and users – will demonstrate the commitment to inform users of cyber threats, to continuously inform DOE of the status of cyber security programs and initiatives, and to seek feedback to continuously improve the Cyber-Security system

**Target 8.2.2.3**

Implement improvements in intrusion detection systems to capture and process network traffic at speeds above 1 GB. Improvements to be accomplished in FY 2009 include:

- the installation and tuning of the Solera system to provide full session capture and replay capabilities from 10 GB network traffic, and
- implementation of the SNORT IDS system running in parallel to capture anomalous network behavior at speeds greater than 10 GB.

ITD will certify the installed systems are tuned and operating effectively.

**Target 8.2.2.4**

Improvements to web application security through multiple methods including:

- training for application developers in secure coding techniques and,
- reducing the footprint of the Laboratory's externally exposed web servers by 20%.

Implement a plan to re-architect external access to web sites and increase use of the reverse proxy and NetContinuum application firewall.

**Measure 8.2.3**

The Contractor will strive to evaluate and adopt DOE and industry best practices.

**Target 8.2.3.1**

Contribute to Cyber-Security initiatives throughout the Office of Science by participating in workshops, peer reviews, security tests and evaluations, information sharing, and by promoting standards and evaluating technologies in collaboration with other laboratories.

**Target 8.2.3.2**

Perform a study on the benefits and impacts of encryption of USB flash memory devices.

**Objective 8.3 – Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property.**

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

**Measure 8.3.1**

Assessment results demonstrate an effective system that protects special nuclear materials (SNM), classified matter, and property. Safeguards and security program is continuously improved.

**Target 8.3.1.1**

External and internal reviews, surveys, and inspections result in satisfactory ratings and no evidence of programmatic failures.

- Corrective actions are promptly implemented and monitored until resolution.
- Surveys are conducted and relevant recommendations implemented to better safeguard Laboratory assets (metals, property, and facilities).

**Measure 8.3.2**

Demonstrating an effective safeguards and security program through security performance.

**Target 8.3.2.1**

Maintaining a well-trained, certified, and properly equipped protective force capable of responding efficiently to security and emergency situations. Meeting all requirements outlined in the DOE Design Basis Threat.

**Target 8.3.2.2**

Continuously improve the performance of the site security surveillance and security alarm system. Assess security alarm system performance by conducting monthly testing and ensuring all shortcomings are reported and immediately corrected.

**Target 8.3.2.3**

Nuclear materials are accounted for, controlled, and protected in accordance with relevant regulation that deter loss, theft, or compromise. Security risk is reduced by further decreasing the Laboratory's special nuclear material inventory.

### **Measure 8.3.3**

Demonstrating an effective safeguards and security program through security documentation.

#### **Target 8.3.3.1**

Maintaining an updated BHSO approved Safeguards and Security Plan, and required Property Protection Plans.

#### **Target 8.3.3.2**

Efficiently managing access authorizations and the foreign visits and assignment processes. [can we better define this?]

### **Objective 8.4 – Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information.**

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

### **Measure 8.4.1**

Strong protection of classified and sensitive information is appropriately demonstrated through assessment, corrective action, and feedback/education.

#### **Target 8.4.1.1**

Assess, mitigate, and properly report security events involving protection of classified and sensitive information within required reporting time frames.

- Incidents of Security Concern are detected, reported, investigated, and resolved in accordance with DOE M 470.4-1 Section N.

#### **Target 8.4.1.2**

Demonstrate an effective Security system through external reviews, surveys, and inspections validated by satisfactory ratings and no evidence of programmatic failures.

- Corrective actions are promptly implemented and monitored until resolution.
- Reducing security risk by maintaining an effective information security program protecting and controlling sensitive and classified information. Consistently implement protective measures to deter the loss, theft, or compromise of classified materials.
- Managing a strong security awareness training program addressing the identification and protection of sensitive unclassified information, classified information, and safeguards and security reporting requirements.

### **Measure 8.4.2**

Implement an effective counterintelligence (CI) program to ensure that the Laboratory, Site Office and serviced facilities are provided the CI services that protect them from foreign intelligence services, espionage and international terrorist related threats.

**Target 8.4.2.1**

Manage the CI program to the site specific CI support plan for the northeast region that includes roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, functions and performance criteria.

**Target 8.4.2.2**

Keep Laboratory management, the Site Office and Headquarters elements informed in a timely manner regarding CI activities and issues. Manage and resolve issues appropriately.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems</b>					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			35%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			35%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			15%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			15%		